

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-20, were rejected under Section 102(e) over *La Medica, Jr.*

Responsive to the rejection of the claims, independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended in manners believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited reference.

Support for the amendments is found on page 5, lines 8-10, page 8, line 26, page 5, lines 18-20, and page 8, line 28.

With respect to exemplary claim 1, the claim has been amended, now to recite that the first identifier stored at the storage element identifies a first selected network operable to communicate pursuant to unregulated use. The recitation of the network detector has been amended, now to recite that the network detector detects which networks of the group of networks operable to communicate pursuant to unregulated use are within communication range of a mobile node. And, the recitation of the selector has been amended, now further to recite that the selector is not to select any networks not identified at the storage element. Method claim 15 has been analogously amended.

While column 6 of the cited reference discloses a mobile station that scans for a broadcast system identifier that matches an identifier of a preferred system stored in memory of the handset, review of the reference indicates that the cited reference pertains to a cellular or PCS communication system. Cellular and PCS communications are carried out on regulated, not unregulated, frequencies. And, because the communications are carried out on regulated frequencies, the operation of the scheme set forth in the cited reference differs with the structure and methodology recited in the claims, as now amended. And, specifically, the identifier stored at the storage element differs in operation with the system identifier identified in the cited reference. And, the network detector recited in claim 1 differs in operation with the scanning of the mobile station disclosed in the cited reference.

Additionally, the selector recited, as now-amended, in claim 1 and the analogous operation of selecting in claim 15, also as now-amended, differs with the modes of operation set forth in the cited reference. Column 7, lines 29-43 of the cited reference, for instance, identifies

Appl. No. 10/786,559
Amdt. dated September 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 27, 2006

four user-selectable modes of operation. None of these modes provides for selection of a network identified by an identifier of a network operable to communicate pursuant to unregulated use and also not to select any network not identified at the storage element.

As none of these recited elements, as now-amended, or corresponding operations, as now-recited, are disclosed in the cited reference, the independent claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited reference.

The dependent claims, that include all the limitations of their respective parent claims, are believed to be distinguishable over the cited reference for the same reasons.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, reexamination and reconsideration of the claims for allowance, as now-amended, is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/robert h. kelly/

Dated: _____
SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com

Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922